

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed May 6, 2003 has been carefully reviewed.
Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejection

In the Office Action mailed May 6, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 USC 112 and stated, "Applicant has not pointed out support in the specification for the amendment 'to reduce damage associated with absorption.'"

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-22 under 35 USC 112. Set out below are quotations and citations to portions of the original specification that include specific recitation and support for the term, "to reduce damage associated with absorption."

Applicants' Original Specification Paragraph Number [0041]

"In the present invention, laser damage concerns are entirely dominated by the former type of laser damage, namely absorption." (lines 8-10)

Applicants' Original Specification Paragraph Number [0059]

"The damage concentration for the unconditioned Sample 1 corresponds to an area of 16 cm² raster scanned at a fluence of 12 J/cm², producing 90 damage sites. As expected, the damage concentration of the unconditioned Sample 1 is large because of absorption of UV laser light by the particulate contaminants. When a different test area of the same size 16 cm² in Sample 1 is conditioned according to methodology A, the number of damage sites produced at 12 J/cm² was reduced to only 8. The damage initiation in the conditioned Sample 1 was reduced by a factor of 10 compared to the unconditioned Sample 1."

Summary

The undersigned respectfully submits that the rejection of claims 1-22 has been fully addressed and overcome. The term, "to reduce damage associated with absorption," included in the Amendment filed on February 19, 2003, is supported by the original specification. The original specification introduces the term by stating, "In the present invention, laser damage concerns are entirely dominated by the former type of laser damage, namely absorption." This is part of the original specification and appears in paragraph number 0041, lines 8-10.

The original specification goes on to provide examples that incorporate the term. In the original specification paragraph number 0059, an example is described wherein methodology A of the present invention is used with sample 1 in connection with "absorption." In the present invention's methodology A, "The damage initiation in the conditioned Sample 1 was reduced by a factor of 10 compared to the unconditioned Sample 1." The original specification goes on to provide additional examples of methodologies of the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eddie E. Scott", written over a horizontal line.

Eddie E. Scott
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 25,220
Tel. No. (925) 424-6897

Livermore, California

Dated: June 16, 2003